JN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,869	02/26/2002	Michael Dahan	28944/40013	8927

29471 7590 04/05/2005

MCCRACKEN & FRANK LLP
200 W. ADAMS STREET
SUITE 2150
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/030,869	DAHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 11-25* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7-10* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/4/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 13-17, 19-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwarts et al. (hereinafter Shwarts, U.S. Patent No. 5,524,201) in view of Apple ("Newton Book Maker User's Guide", Ver. 1.1, Copyright 1995 Apple Computer) and in further view of Borsuk (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,399).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Shwarts teaches *an electronic central unit including a memory and connected to a display screen and to a control interface* (see Fig. 1). Shwarts also teaches that *the memory of the central unit containing at least one document in digital form which is to be presented on the screen and which comprises alphanumeric characters* (Col. 8, lines 9-13). Shwarts also teaches that *said document being constituted for the most part by information that is frozen* in that for an author to prepare an interactive reference (of a hardbound or otherwise paper book), the author simply inserts certain recognized commands within the content of conventional word processing/graphics documents. The system then processes these commands and the associated document content to produce a completed interactive reference (Col. 2, lines 30-34). Shwarts also teaches the notion of "dot" commands that will preferably be easy

to distinguish from the body of the work (Col. 11, lines 1-13). Note that these commands will not be visible in the final compilation of the interactive book (*the document contains pagination markers that are not visible on the screen*) (Col. 2, lines 46-49; Figs. 3-10). Shwarts fails to explicitly teach that *each marker comprises at least one identity code corresponding to a display configuration representative of the way in which the document is to be presented on the screen*. However, Apple teaches *page layout* commands that define general formatting characteristics for the page, such as the number of columns and placement of graphics. *Page layout* commands are also used to attach scripts to text and graphics in a Newton digital book. The *layout* command uses the following syntax: .layout *name width* [*flags*] [*layoutFlags*]. In particular, the *name* attribute, which is required, allows other entities in the book to *use this string to apply this layout by name*. For example, if the *.layout* command defines the name *myLayout* parameter, other content items can apply *myLayout* by including the parameter layout=*myLayout*. It is important to give each *.layout* a different name; repeating the names of *.layout* commands causes errors (Appendix A, p. A-26). Thus, the *name* parameter acts as an *identity code corresponding to a display configuration*. Incidentally, most of the commands that are used with Apple Computer's Book Maker application are described in more general terms by the invention of Shwarts. Among these commands are so-called page "content" commands (Appendix A, p. A-11). Each of these commands has attributes, called content flags (Appendix A, p. A-34). *Several of these content flags initiate page breaks* (e.g., StartsPage) (Appendix A, Table A-3). Thus, Apple teaches *pagination markers including at least page break markers which*

subdivide the document into pages, and the identity codes comprised in the various pagination markers corresponding to a plurality of display configurations, themselves corresponding to a plurality of paginations on the screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple helps to better define specific commands. Neither Shwarts nor Apple teach that *the memory contains at least one identity code corresponding to an active display configuration with which the document is to be presented on the screen.* However, Borsuk teaches a portable hand held reading unit that has, as one possible storage device, an EPROM device (41) or other storage device that can be inserted into the slot (18), the data is then accessed and loaded into the RAM (44) (step 79) with the first or title page of the data being displayed on the screen (8) (Step 86) in a default font size, for example, of approximately 12 point (Col. 6, lines 60-66). This suggests that the memory device contains information that once downloaded to RAM in the display device tells the device how to display content on the screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts, Apple, and Borsuk as all three inventions are related to creating and displaying electronic books. Adding the teaching of Borsuk provides the benefit of default settings for a reading device used for viewing an electronic book. Shwarts continues by teaching that *the electronic central unit is adapted to paginate the document using the pagination markers, which correspond to the active display configuration* (Col. 11, lines 17-43; Fig.

12). In particular, step 115 converts the page descriptions produced in step 114 and the records produced in step 113 to a file of scripts. The scripts are provided in a language that can ultimately be understood by the machine that will run the interactive reference (i.e., the system containing the content engine). This step also (1) encodes searching aids known as "hint bits" for some of the records, and (2) links sources and destinations for live screen actions. The resulting script can then be compiled and used by a content engine in a pointer-based computer. Thus, Shwarts teaches *presenting the document on the screen in said active display configuration with a page break for each page break marker corresponding to said active display configuration, the pages defined by the page breaks which correspond to the active display configuration being such that each of said pages appears in full on the screen when it is displayed with the active display configuration.*

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach about *illustration markers corresponding to illustrations inserted in the text, said illustration markers being invisible on the screen.* However, Apple teaches the *.picture* content command (Appendix A, p. A-18). The format for this command contains a *at least one identity code corresponding to a display configuration* in that the .picture command has an attribute for a *layout=myLayout* identifying a previously defined display configuration (Appendix A, pp. A-18, 19). It also has *at least one code representative of the corresponding illustration* in that the .picture command has a "path" attribute which gives the location of the graphic and a *name* attribute which assigns a name (code) to refer to the graphic (Appendix A, pp. A-18, 19). Apple also teaches *coded position and/or size*

information in that the .picture command has height and width attributes indicating the size (Appendix A, pp. A-18, 19). Apple also teaches that *the electronic central unit being adapted to present the document on the screen with each illustration positioned and/or dimensioned on the corresponding page as a function of said coded position and/or size information contained in the illustration marker for said illustration that corresponds to the active configuration* in that when the encoded book is displayed, the graphic is displayed on the book reader (Chapter 2, pp. 18-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of enabling the display of graphics in an electronic book.

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach that *the illustration markers further comprise coded information concerning the visible presentation of illustrations, said coded information being representative of optical characteristics of each point forming part of the illustration*. However, Apple teaches that the .picture command has height and width attributes indicating the size (Appendix A, pp. A-18, 19). These attributes would act to define the visible presentation of illustrations in that it defines the physical size of the illustration on the display screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both inventions relate to electronic books. Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of displaying graphics on the display of the electronic book reader of a reasonable dimension (hence size).

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Shwarts teaches that the pen-based computer system (10) of Fig. 1 is shown housed within a generally rectangular enclosure (50). Shwarts does not explicitly state the housing is portable. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the device described by Shwarts housing the electronic book is portable or hand-held, allowing the user to take the book with them.

In regard to dependent Claim 16 and 17, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach that *the identity code for each displayed configuration corresponds to at least one screen characteristic specific to the display screen* and *said screen characteristic is a screen size*. However, Apple teaches that the .layout command has a width attribute that relates to the screen size in that it designates a column width (Appendix A, p. A-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of including images in the ebook.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, dependent claim 19 reflects the electronic document display appliance as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale. In addition, Shwarts teaches long term mass storage (22) such as commercially available miniature hard disk drive, nonvolatile memory such as flash memory, battery backed RAM, or PCMCIA card, or the like (*data medium*) (Col. 5, lines 60-63).

In regard to dependent Claim 20, neither Shwarts nor Apple explicitly teaches *a downloading method comprising at least one step consisting in downloading into the memory of an electronic document display appliance*. However, Borusk teaches that the text data stored in location (44) is in the form of text characters inputted into the reading unit (1) from a variety of different input sources. These encoded characters may be downloaded from the insertable EPROM (41) source, or even a portable ROM device, all of which may take the form of a chip, microfloppy disk, micro CD ROM, or optical card placed into the port (18) in the housing (2). These storage devices may in turn be loaded with data from the texts of literary works such a novels, tabloids or periodicals that have been transformed into digital format consequently used by the reading unit (1) (Col. 5, lines 57-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts, Apple, and Borsuk as all three inventions are related to creating and displaying electronic books. Adding the teaching of Borsuk provides the benefit of viewing the electronic book without an external storage device attached.

In regard to dependent Claim 21, Shwarts teaches *software comprising at least one data file loadable into the memory of a document display appliance* in that a plurality of application programs (sometimes referred to as packages) may be stored in the system's memory. By way of example, the notepad, a calendar application, an address book application, a to-do list application and a variety of other application programs may be provided. The subject of the present invention, the content engine, may also be stored in the system's memory. The memory may be divided into two or

more discrete sections (sometimes referred to as stores herein), which represent separately addressable segments of memory. By way of example, internal RAM that acts as a first portion of memory may be considered one store. A PCMCIA card, which can be a part of mass storage (22), may be considered a second store. Within each store, much of the data may be divided into a plurality of different record files (sometimes called soups herein). The record files each include a number of records that are to be used with one or more of the specific application files. In one suitable embodiment, each page (screen-full) of text constitutes a separate record, with each record being given a record number that is unique within that application file. Thus, for example, within the calendar application file, there may initially be thirty records. These records would be given record numbers zero to twenty-nine, respectively (Col. 8, lines 34-57).

In regard to dependent Claim 22, Claim 22 reflects the electronic document display appliance as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale. In addition, Apple also teaches *a) determining the identity code of an active display configuration, with which the document is to be presented on the screen* in that when the book maker file is compiled and executed on a viewer that the .layout command, which contain a *layout=myLayout* name attribute, will define an active display configuration. In the course of executing the compiled book containing the .layout command and *layout=myLayout* name attribute, Apple also teaches that the device will *paginate the document* according to previously defined attributes associated with the layout command. Apple also teaches that the book will be *displayed on the viewer*

according to the previously defined attributes associated with the .layout command. Apple also teaches that *each of the pages is visible in full on the screen while it is being displayed with the active display configuration* in that when the reserved slot name *curRendering* is assigned the value of zero, the full screen is used to render the page (pp. 4-16,17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of a language by which a document can be converted to an electronic book for use with a book reading device.

In regard to dependent Claim 24, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach *determining an identity code relating to the screen characteristic corresponding to the display screen of the electronic document display appliance*. However, Apple teaches that the .layout command has a width (*a screen characteristic*) attribute that relates to the screen size in that it designates a column width (Appendix A, p. A-26). Apple does not teach the storage of such codes in the memory of the device. However, the mere fact that the identity codes are contained within the ebook, would have made obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that during the execution of the ebook, the .layout commands associated with a *myLayout* name would have been stored in the memory of the device used to display the ebook for the user to read, providing the benefit of an ebook that is easily read on a given screen, regardless of any limitations it may have. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of a language by which a document can be converted to an electronic book for use with a book reading device.

In regard to dependent Claim 25, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach determining a first identity code relating to the screen characteristic, which corresponds to the display screen of the electronic document display appliance. However, Apple teaches that the .layout command has a width (a screen characteristic) attribute that relates to the screen size in that it designates a column width (Appendix A, p. A-26). Apple does not teach the storage of such codes in the memory of the device. However, the mere fact that the identity codes are contained within the ebook, would have made obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that during the execution of the ebook, the .layout commands associated with a myLayout name would have been stored in the memory of the device used to display the ebook for the user to read, providing the benefit of an ebook that is easily read on a given screen, regardless of any limitations it may have. In addition, Apple teaches that as long as the myLayout names are different, a given ebook can contain many such layouts identified by different names (Appendix A, p. A-26). Hence, Apple also teaches determining a second identity code corresponding to the character style group to which the selected character style belongs since the .layout command, and its associated myLayout name would be processed when encountered in the execution of the ebook. For reasons argued above, storing

said second identity code in the memory and determining an identity code for the active display configuration that corresponds to said first and second identity codes, and storing it in the memory would also have obviously taken place. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of a language by which a document can be converted to an electronic book for use with a book reading device.

Claims 2-6, 11-12, 18, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwarts in view of Apple and in further view of Borsuk and in further view of Huffman et al. (hereinafter Huffman, U.S. Patent No. 5,893,132).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Shwarts fails to explicitly teach *an appliance in which the memory contains characteristic data defining a plurality of possible character styles, corresponding to a plurality of paginations on the screen*. However, Huffman teaches a font selection page (*a control interface adapted to enable a user to select one character style from various possible styles*) displayed on an embodiment of an electronic book. The font selection page is displayed upon an initiation of the font selection routine. Displayed on the font selection page are a number of font/size combination options. Each option is in the form of a word displayed using a specific font and a specific size in accordance with the font/size combination (suggesting that *said character styles being subdivided into a plurality of groups of character styles,*

comprising a single character style or a plurality of character styles of similar sizes). A user selects a desired font/size combination by viewing how words appear in the various combinations, and selecting the combination, which is desired. For example, in Fig. 9, the user is selecting a desired font/size combination by selecting a word (250) displayed in the desired font/size combination using his or her finger (212) (Col. 11, lines 27-31; Fig. 9). Huffman also suggests an *active display configuration corresponding at least to an "active" group of character styles to which the character style selected by the user belongs* in that upon selecting the desired font/size combination, the electronic book automatically flips back to the title page containing the system controls. Thereafter, the electronic book uses the desired font/size combination as a primary font/size combination to display the text of the book (Col. 11, lines 27-31; Fig. 9). Thus, Huffman associates a character style with a configuration that remains the active configuration until such time that the user changes it using the font selection page described above. Huffman does not teach the notion of an *identity code* to associate with the active configuration of character style (font/size combo). However, Apple teaches the .layout command's attribute *name=myLayout* that associates a number of layout-related attributes to the layout name (Appendix A, p. A-26). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts, Huffman, and Apple as all three inventions relate to generating and ultimately viewing electronic books. The teaching of Huffman provides the benefit of being able to select different character styles and sizes, and to store those selections as the active configuration; the active configuration associated with a layout

name=myLayout attribute/value pair taught by Apple. The overall benefit would have been to provide the user with an adjustable electronic book customizable to their needs.

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Shwarts fails to specifically teach that *each page break marker includes a code, which represents a page number*. However, Apple teaches the *.option* miscellaneous command that enables a specified option for the current book. The .option command has an attribute (slot) called *optionName* to which can be assigned a *firstPage* value that relates to each visible content item, and contains the number of the page on which the content item appears (Appendix A, p. A-31). It also seems from this teaching that Apple's invention would place the page number so that it corresponded to the page it was a part of (compare to *the page situated immediately ahead of the page break marker*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both the invention and reference relate to a command language to convert electronic versions of books to so-called "ebooks". Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of defining page numbers.

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Shwarts fails to specifically teach that *at least one of the groups of character styles corresponding to the page break markers comprises a plurality of character styles of similar sizes*. However, Huffman teaches a font selection page containing a number of font/size combination options. Each option is in the form of a word displayed using a specific font and a specific size in accordance with the font/size combination. A user selects a desired font/size combination by viewing how words appear in the various combinations, and selecting the combination, which is

desired (Col. 11, lines 27-31; Fig. 9). Thus, Huffman suggests the possibility of a group of character styles containing similar sizes existing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Huffman as both inventions relate to electronic book rendering. Adding the teaching of Huffman provides the benefit of a variety of combinations of character styles and sizes. Huffman fails to teach that *the page break markers which correspond to said group of character styles being positioned in the document so that the various pages of the document as defined by these page break markers are visible in full on the screen for all of the character styles belonging to said group of character styles when said group of character styles is the active group*. However, Apple teaches that when the reserved slot name *curRendering* is assigned the value of zero, the full screen is used to render the page (pp. 4-16,17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts, Huffman, and Apple as all three teachings relate to electronic books. The addition of Apple provides the benefit of specific commands to deal with page markers.

In regard to dependent Claim 5, dependent Claim 5 reflects the electronic document display appliance as claimed in Claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale. In addition, Shwarts and Huffman fail to specifically teach *scaling (using the central unit) a page using a scaling factor specific to each character style*. However, Apple teaches that the fonts used in the Newton are bitmapped, as opposed to TruType and therefore get scaled by the system when the Newton displays the book (p. B-1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts, Huffman, and Apple as all three inventions relate to the construction and display of electronic books. Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of scaling fonts so that the user can more easily read the electronic book.

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Shwarts fails to teach that *the central unit is adapted to determine a scale factor automatically that is suitable for a page and a character style while said page is being displayed with the character style in question.* However, Apple teaches that when the reserved slot name *curRendering* is assigned the value of zero, the full screen is used to render the page (pp. 4-16,17). This suggests that the viewer for Apple's teaching (Newton PDA) can automatically scale the electronic book based on the layouts defined in it. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shwarts and Apple as both inventions relate to electronic books. Adding the teaching of Apple provides the benefit of auto-scaling thus eliminating the need for the user to do it manually.

In regard to dependent Claims 11 and 12, Shwarts fails to specifically teach that *the central unit is adapted to store the character style most recently selected by the user in a non-volatile internal memory.* However, Huffman teaches that upon selecting the desired font/size combination, the electronic book automatically flips back to the title page containing the system controls. Thereafter, the electronic book uses the desired font/size combination as a primary font/size combination to display the text of the book (Col. 11, lines 27-31). From this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that the electronic book-reading device of Huffman would store the font/size information in memory until such time that the font/size combination was again changed. Thus, the book-reading device of Huffman would have retained in memory a prior setting. This would allow the user the capability of an "undo" function or the ability to recall a previous setting. Assuming from the teaching above that Huffman stores setting information in memory, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to display such information on the screen of the electronic book reader, providing the benefit of reminding the user how the electronic book was originally laid out.

In regard to dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 reflects the electronic document display appliance as claimed in Claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 23, claim 23 reflects the electronic document display appliance as claimed in Claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
03/18/05

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER